DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 379 HE 013 385

AUTHOR Topping, Norman
TITLE To Be or Not To Be. The First Earl V. Pullias Lecture in Higher and Postsecondary Education, 1979.
INSTITUTION University of Southern California, Los Angeles. Dept. of Higher Education.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 23p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Students: Articulation (Education): College Students: Continuing Education: *Educational Finance: *Educational Trends: Employment: Financial Problems: Financial Support: *Higher Education: Intercollegiate Cooperation: *Middle Class Students: *Retrenchment: Tuition

ABSTRACT

Changes that have occurred in higher education in the last 20 years are briefly sketched and the present state of financial difficulty being experienced by all the institutions as well as possible solutions are considered. Two major factors driving costs upward for higher education have been inflation and government regulations. Assets of higher education include modern facilities that were built in the last decade or two, an upgraded faculty, dedicated Boards of Trustees, alumni that contribute generously, and financial support from business and industry. Liabilities for private institutions over the next decade will be financing if present conditions continue, the relatively large number of research personnel on federal funds, the very conservative stance of departments and their faculties, and the large number of foreign students in American universities. Possible solutions include emphasizing adult education and adjusting to the needs of working adults. To assist middle-income families in financing their children's higher education, possible solutions are the formation of a tuition insurance corporation by a consortium of universities and better cooperation and integration among community colleges and professional and graduate schools. Commentary by Earl V. Pullias is included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED196379

Earl V. Pullias

Lecture In Higher Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Pullias Lectureship Endowment Fund
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

University of Southern California

1979

HE 013 385

Norman Topping

TO BE OR NOT TO BE

by
Norman Topping, M.D., Sc.D., LL.D., L.H.D.
Chancellor
University of Southern California

The First Earl V. Pullias Lecture in Higher and Postsecondary Education

1979

Published by the Pullias Lectureship Endowment Fund, the Department of Higher and Postsecondary Education, School of Education, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 90007

Higher education carries a heavy responsibility in modern society. No institution has greater opportunities to contribute significantly to the upward movement which modern man must achieve. Higher education at its best is the only institution in modern society that is free to seek answers to all the problems that confront man, through the use of every method the mind of man can conceive. By its very nature the primary allegiance of higher education is to truth: its discovery, its wide dissemination, and its effective application to the questions of life.

Earl V. Pullias in
Toward Excellence in College Teaching

Earl V. Pullias is professor emeritus at the University of Southern California. He has been a teacher, administrator, and consultant. He remains an active civic leader. A graduate of Cumberland University (Tennessee), he earned a master's at University of Chicago, and then a Ph.D. from Duke University. After initial work as a psychologist, he came to Pepperdine College as a professor, and shortly after, Dean of the Faculty. In 1957, he came to the University of Southern California to establish the Department of Higher and Postsecondary Education.

He is a prolific writer, with efforts in the last twenty years directed towards the philosophical issues in the higher learning. Dr. Pullias has published more than 100 research and theoretical articles and reviews. His book (with James D. Young) *A Teacher is Many Things* has been translated into nine languages and received international recognition. Other works include *Towards Excellence in College Teaching* (with Alileen Lockhart), *A Search for Understanding*, and his last work, *A Common Sense Philosophy for Modern Man: A Search for Fundamentals.*

He and his wife, Pauline, live in Los Angeles.

THE PULLIAS LECTURESHIP . . .

As Professor Earl V. Pullias approached emeritus status, many of his former students and friends asked for an opportunity to express tangibly their affection and respect. Professor Pullias expressed a desire to have these efforts directed towards establishing a lectureship in the Department of Higher and Postsecondary Education and School of Education at the University of Southern California.

The Department was first formed in 1961 with Professor Pullias as its chairman. Since that time, over 300 students have received their doctorates from the Department.

The Lectureship was arranged to bring a nationally recognized scholar to the campus that would augment Departmental programs for the faculty and student environment. The publication and national dissemination of the lectureship presentations was designed to add to the ongoing academic dialogue on significant topics in higher and postsecondary education.

A Steering Committee has served to initiate the Pullias Lectureship and was composed of Dr. Leslie Wilbur, University of Southern California; Dr. Roger Hendrix, University of Southern California; Dr. Richard Perry, University of Southern California; Dr. William Millington, University of Southern California; Dr. Clive L. Grafton, University of Southern California; Harry Marlow, Los Angeles County; Dr. Virginia Pfiffner, El Camino College; Dr. Viktor Christensen, Loma Linda University; Dr. Hamilton Maddaford, El Camino College; Dr. John Grande, Glendale College; Dr. Robert Rupert, Los Angeles Unified School District; Dr. Lloyd Nelson, University of Southern California; Dr. Robert Bess, California State University and Colleges; Dr. James Young, California State University, Fullerton; Dr. Wayne Frarie, University of Southern California; Dr. John Cashin, Santa Monica College; Dr. William Waechter, Long Beach City College.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FIRST PULLIAS LECTURER

. . .

by
Paul E. Hadley, Ph.D.
Academic Vice President
University of Southern California

It is altogether proper that Chancellor Norman Topping has been designated as the first Pullias Lecturer. As President of the University of Southern California, Dr. Topping made a profound impact on its academic, organizational, and physical structure. In his inaugural address in 1958 he laid out a program of development which was fulfilled to a remarkable degree during his term of office. I should like to give two or three illustrations of Dr. Topping's behavior as the Chief Executive Officer of this University.

As president, Norman Topping was much interested in the development of the University in its urban community setting. It was under his leadership that the Urban Semester concept was born, the Community Service Center established, and an academic program in ethnic studies inaugurated. Basic to Dr. Topping's philosophy of urban education was the prevailing concept that the University must function as a *university*, an influence for higher education in its community. Community service, therefore, is an appropriate role for an institution of higher learning to the extent that community service embodies the institution's role as a university not merely as a service agency.

Dr. Topping was president of the University of Southern California during the unruly days of the 1960's, when the social and political tensions of the nation broke into violence on many university campuses. Such was the prestige of the presidency at USC and such was the understanding revealed by its president that demonstrations were peaceful and the dialogue between the administration and the students was never interrupted. When national disturbances broke out after the invasion of Cambodia and the riots at Jackson State and Kent State Universities, President Topping declared a period of University dedication to the consideration of the massive problems of the day. Classes were cancelled and students, faculty, and administrators engaged in discussion, debate, and rational political activity. Perhaps at no time during the decade was the

morale on the campus as high as during those "days of concern."

I have one personal anecdote which illustrates another aspect of Dr. Topping's administration. I was riding back from a professional meeting in San Francisco with my predecessor as Academic Vice President, Dr. Milton Kloetzel. It had been a difficult Saturday; we were both rather tired; and I said something about being glad to go home for the evening. Dr. Kloetzel responded: "I am not going home, I am going back to the office. You know I would resent working Saturday night at the University if I didn't know that Norman Topping was going to be there too."

Dr. Topping's entry in *Who's Who* is characteristically modest but impressive. He was born in Missouri in 1908. He took his Bachelor of Arts degree at the University of Southern California in 1933 and his M.D. in 1936. He was married in 1930 to Helen Rummens. The Toppings have two children, Brian and Linda. Dr. Topping did his internship in the United States Public Health Service Marine Hospitals in San Francisco and Seattle and became a member of the staff of the National Institute of Health in Bethesda, where he became Assistant Chief of the Division of Infectious Diseases. He was then promoted to Assistant Surgeon General and then Associate Director of the National Institute of Health. He entered university administration as Vice President for Medical Affairs at the University of Pennsylvania, from which position he came to the University of Southern California as President in 1958. He became Chancellor in 1970. Dr. Topping's research has been in the field of viral and rickettsial disease. He served as Chairman of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis and a member of its research committee. He was also President of the American Society for Tropical Medicine and received a medal from the United States Typhus Commission. He is a diplomate of the American Board of Preventive Medicine and Public Health. In Los Angeles after his retirement from the presidency he served the city well as president of the Southern California Rapid Transit District. Dr. Topping continues as an active member of the University's Board of Trustees and is a frequent advisor and indefatigable worker in the development programs of the University.

It is an honor and a matter of deep satisfaction for me to present Chancellor Norman Topping as the first Pullias Lecturer.

THE 1979 PULLIAS LECTURE

TO BE OR NOT TO BE

BY

NORMAN TOPPING, M.D., Sc.D., LL.D., L.H.D.
Chancellor
University of Southern California

Twenty years ago, in 1958, I said the following in an address:

"For the next decade or so we shall experience a boom in education in this country never even imagined. It will be a subject for public and private debate; it will appear in planks in political platforms; it will demand increased appropriations at federal, state, and local levels; it will invite increased philanthropies from individuals, corporations, and foundations. Once again the teaching profession will be highly regarded by our society; it may even be that the term *egg-head* will no longer be used as a term of derision. Our universities will be recognized as the true fountainheads of learning, progress, freedom, and as the great social instruments that they are. Our contributions through the fundamental sciences to an ever-expanding and advancing technology no longer can be denied and, in fact, are now evident as one of the major factors in our national security. Increasing numbers of students will be knocking for admission at the doors of the institutions of higher learning, not only because of the higher birth rates of twenty years ago but because society will more fully recognize that those with excellent educational backgrounds are more competent to live happily and be more productive in our complex communities."

Now, having spent more than twenty-five years in higher education and having observed some of those things transpire, I think perhaps the time has come not only to contemplate the tremendous changes that

have occurred but also to try to forecast the future. During this period we have seen enrollments climb from a little over two million to almost seven. We have seen the development of the community college as well as other two-year educational institutions. We have seen the shift in emphasis from teaching to research in our major universities, primarily brought about by ever-increasing funds from the federal government for research and development. This has caused an unusual development in the sciences and engineering, sometimes to the detriment of other segments of the university. We have seen a draft policy that has encouraged many young men to remain on the campuses far beyond the normal time and not infrequently longer than they might prefer. We have felt an increasing pressure for the admission and financing of ever-increasing numbers of the economically disadvantaged, sometimes even with strident demands to disregard recognized standards for admission and retention in the colleges and universities. During this same time we have seen major changes in the educational process itself: smaller classes, reduced teaching load for faculty but an increase in faculty compensation, extensive curricular changes to make education more relevant in today's world. And finally the turmoil, strife, violence and destruction of the years 1965-1970. These five years represent the greatest threat to all education that it has ever had to suffer.

During this period the news media certainly gave adequate coverage to the startling events. Student folk-heroes developed almost overnight: Mario Savio, Joan Baez, Dave Harris, Mark Rudd and countless others. Our campuses became the platform for the Cleavers, Rubins, Kunstlers, and the like. Television news almost became the night's horror show, depicting the riots, fires, bombings, guns on campus and even death. The printed media was not far behind in pictures, articles and editorials. As a minority of students and faculty became more overt in their re-

volutionary acts, the administrators more frustrated, the public ire rose in intensity. Bond issues were defeated, appropriations reduced, contributions from alumni and friends diminished; all the while inflation was steadily increasing the costs of operations.

Now the quiet. Has the storm blown itself out or are we in the eye of the hurricane? Even though this is a constantly nagging question, there are many others of even greater importance to higher education. Of primary importance at the moment is the financial crunch being experienced by all the institutions. The inflationary trend has brought ever-rising costs in salaries and wages, in utilities, in materials and supplies, and, not to be forgotten, in fringe benefits in order to stay somewhat competitive in our communities.

Another major factor is the constantly upward pressure on costs because of government regulations. These affect hiring, facilities for the handicapped and other areas. The Library of Congress recently counted 439 federal statutory agencies with some jurisdiction over higher education. Notre Dame's Hesburgh has said: "Every time the Federal Government comes up with a bright idea for a new regulation it helps drive our costs through the ceiling." How are these escalating costs to be met over the years ahead. For the public institutions, supported by tax dollars, increased appropriations plus increased tuition and fees to the students. In the private colleges and universities the students and their families will, of necessity, have to bear the major burden of these increasing costs. As examples, Harvard tuition, room and board is $7500; also Yale, Bennington and M.I.T.

To quote from a January issue of *Time* Magazine: "Economists argue that private colleges are as affordable as ever, since aftertax income has risen as fast as tuition, or faster. Yet by that reckoning, public colleges are a bigger bargain than ever, since the gap between public and private student tuition has grown

from $416 yearly in 1956 to more than $2,000 today." Adds Stanford President Richard Lyman: "At some point, and I don't know where that point is, it will no longer be a rational decision to attend a private institution, regardless of the value of its education."

For many that point has already passed. Ten colleges shut their doors in 1978 bringing the total closings for the decade to 129. A Carnegie study predicts that as many as 300 institutions will vanish through the 1980s.

One could go on in this somewhat gloomy manner almost indefinitely but to no good end. What is really needed is to inventory our assets and liabilities with the purpose of designing a constructive course of action. There can be little doubt that the assets of higher education far outweigh its liabilities. The excellent facilities are in place, a high quality faculty exists, dedicated Boards of Trustees preside and myriads of loyal alumni contribute generously. Over the past few years there have been increasing contributions to the private colleges and universities from Business and Industry.

To elaborate — in the late '50s-'60s and early 1970s fine new modern facilities sprang up on our campuses almost like mushrooms. There was no question that they were badly needed but perhaps we overbuilt in view of the projected drop in numbers of college-age people in the next decade. But those facilities are there and must be fully utilized in the future.

During that same period faculties were upgraded. Compensation and fringe benefits were increased to be more competitive so that the fine faculties could be retained and recruitment of new faculty members facilitated. They too must be fully utilized in the years ahead.

We do have dedicated Boards of Trustees who give most generously of their interest, time and resources to help keep the institutions academically excellent and financially viable. There are some 1500 private colleges and universities in this country; the boards

average 20 members. This amounts to 30,000 prominent citizens deeply interested in the future of private higher education in the United States.

There can be no question that there are millions of alumni scattered through our population and most of them are loyal and contributors to their alma mater. In fact, 1,100 of the institutions report 19,500,000 alums. These alums form the very backbone of the fund drives being mounted. A recent tabulation indicated that just seven of these have for a five-year goal about $2 billion with about $1.3 billion either in hand or pledged.

Another great asset has been the increasing contributions to our private colleges and universities by business and industry. There has been an increase in their contributions over the past 10 years of about 60%, from $214 million in 1967 to $357 million in 1977. "Money," Jess Unruh once said, "is the mother's milk of politics." So it is to private higher education. There are many in business and industry that are still not convinced that our liberal faculties do not represent a real threat to the private enterprise system. We need to mount a concerted educational program for those individuals in the hope that this criticism can be blunted.

Now to our liabilities — There can be little doubt that the greatest liability for the private institutions over the next decade will be their financing. If inflation continues unabated, unemployment increases together with the projected decrease in college-age students, it is obvious that the financial impact could be disastrous.

Another liability, particularly in the larger universities, is the relatively large number of research personnel on so-called "soft money." We have seen over the past several years a reduction in federal funds available for the support of the research effort in the universities. Jerome Weisner, President of M.I.T. in a recent address pointed out that the reduction in federal funding for research is gradually reducing the universities' capabilities to perform one of their major functions, the search for new knowledge. This is particularly true in basic research. Categori-

cal funds for such as cancer, heart disease, arthritis, lasers, energy, oceanography and the like remain fairly stable. The reduction in basic research means that well organized research teams will not be funded and will be broken up, and most important, there will be less and less opportunity for promising young researchers to find appropriate positions in our universities.

Another liability — the very conservative stance of our departments and their faculties is a real impediment to innovation in education. The comment has been made that faculties are more concerned with recognition by their discipline peers than by any substantive changes in education. The universities have abetted this by insisting on publications and attendance at the various association meetings for merit increases in salary and for promotions. Those dedicated to teaching and counseling of students are frequently penalized.

Another liability is the rather large number of foreign students we have on campuses today. It has been reported that about 250,000 of them are now present and the majority are in the private colleges and universities. You might ask why they should be considered a liability. They are very clanish, they do not usually participate in student activities and return to their native country when they have secured their education. Our recent experience with the Iranian students in the fiasco in Beverly Hills indicates they are more concerned with political ramifications in their homeland than with the future of our educational institutions.

How can we, in private higher education, take advantage of our assets and at the same time lessen our liabilities. One major move is already underway; it is the increasing emphasis being placed on adult education. Many institutions during the past several years have established a College or a School of Continuing Education to offer specialized courses to new groups of students. Many of these are tailored and the classroom hours are adjusted to the needs of working adults. With this approach National University in San Diego now has 3400 students with an average age of 30. It has been said, and rightly so, that there is

a greying of our campuses. With this increasing emphasis on adult education we take advantage of two of our assets — the excellent faculty and the fine facilities — and we offset a liability by increasing tuition income to help meet the financial crunch.

It was said for many years that only the poor or the wealthy received good medical care; the middle-income group could not afford the rising costs. But now Blue Cross, Blue Shield and other forms of third-party coverage have changed all that. Private education faces similar problems. The economically disadvantaged have a variety of sources — Federal, State and University — to assist them in their financing of higher education. These range from the Basic Educational Grant, Work Study Programs, guaranteed low-interest rate loans, and State scholarships. The well-to-do have little or no difficulty in meeting the educational costs for their offspring. Again it's that middle-income group that find themselves with limited options for the education of their children. Just this year there was some recognition of the problem by the Federal Government, as it raised the level of family income from $15,000 to $25,000 still retaining eligibility for Government support. Although this will be helpful, it still does not answer our concern for the family with more than one child of college age in an income bracket of a little more than $25,000.

One possible solution might be a consortium of at least several of the major universities forming a Tuition Insurance Corporation where regular payments could be made by the parents years before the children reach college age. The Corporation, perhaps even through one of the existing insurance companies, could then guarantee the availability of funds for tuition when needed. This tuition corporation might very well receive financial support at its beginning by several of the Foundations. Let's not forget that the Carnegie Foundation provided the early seed money that led to the formation and development of T.I.A.A.

Another possible solution to the dilemma faced by the middle-income group could be a better cooperation and integration of our educational institutions.

In California alone there are well over 100 community colleges with a tremendous student enrollment. A great many of these have excellent reputations for their academic programs. Have our private institutions seriously attempted to plan an upper division program or programs specifically for those graduating from these community colleges? I doubt if there has been a joint cooperative effort to integrate the course offerings between the two types of institutions.

What are some of the advantages that would accrue from such a cooperative effort? First, for that middle-income family's children who wish to go on to graduate or professional studies. They could have their first two years in a community college close by where tuition is very low. They could live at home without the high costs of room and board or commuting. They could work part time during the academic year and full time during the summers locally. This would allow the student and family to conserve their resources for two full years to help meet the high cost of the subsequent education.

Secondly, there are advantages for our community colleges. They would have the opportunity to work directly with those most knowledgeable of the requirements for students to continue in professional or graduate education. It would also allow them to assure their students that the course offerings were completely integrated with the four-year institutions. Thus there would be no loss of time or credits as they pursue their ultimate educational objective.

Thirdly, there are definite advantages for the private institutions that offer advanced degrees in the professional and graduate fields. It is a well-known fact that there is considerable attrition in the first two years of college, particularly in the first. This coupled with the projected decline over the next few years of college-age students bodes ill for our institutions. Better integration and cooperation could offset these two negatives and augment the upper division enrollments. Our athletic departments, particularly in California, have long recognized the great advantage of recruiting proven athletes from our community colleges. Perhaps it is now time for our academic

establishment to do likewise. There is no logical reason why the first two years of pre-med, dentistry, law, education, business, architecture and the like could not and perhaps should not be pursued in our community colleges. These transfer students would be more mature, they would have had two years of exposure to higher education, and their educational objectives would be better defined. By aggressively pursuing such cooperation several things could be attained: retention of tuition income to help in the financial crunch, and utilization of our excellent faculty and fine facilities.

I am not proposing that our so-called research universities become only upper division and graduate and professional schools but that greater emphasis be placed there. This area, however, is the most expensive in all higher education, so that careful cost controls as well as financial analysis become imperative. We are rapidly reaching the point where we can no longer try to be all things to all people. We must identify clearly our mission as well as our capabilities and organize our educational programs accordingly.

However, it will take concerted effort to bring about the necessary changes. The faculty and administration of the various institutions involved will have to be convinced of the advantage of a cooperative effort. This will not be easy, for academe's obsession with participatory democracy and the proliferation of committees, commissions, centers, and institutes has made the road to innovation and change quite hazardous. There has to be a realization of the financial crisis that all higher education faces in the '80s. Steps must be taken now, before it is too late, or we will see a steady erosion of the quality of education.

There can be no question that following the Russian Sputnik in 1957 there was a burgeoning in both our private and public educational institutions. We have grown fat on a high caloric diet of dollars. Now we shall have to reduce, but it must be done carefully so as not to injure our health. Our mode for the next decade must not be business as usual or the "Steady State" but survival. As Shakespeare put it in *Hamlet*: "To be or not to be: that is the question: whether t'is nobler in the mind to suffer the slings and arrows of

outrageous fortune, or to take arms against a sea of troubles, and by opposing end them?"

All of this indicates to me, that intensive planning by those most interested in the preservation of private higher education is an absolute necessity. We, in the United States, have been primarily responsible for its development and we cannot afford now just to sit by and watch its deterioration. As Lincoln once wrote to his law partner: "Don t let the worship of the past, nor the confusion of the present, interfere with realistic planning for the future." This then should be our motto in higher education for the years ahead.

RESPONSE TO THE FIRST PULLIAS LECTURE . . .

by

Earl V. Pullias
Professor Emeritus
University of Southern California

Mr. Chairman, President Topping, and other beloved friends of the higher learning:

This has been another very good occasion: warm with fellowship and mutual respect; enriched by the renewal of the precious bonds of friendship; enlivened by learning and thought; made sacred by the all-encompassing spirit of place so characteristic of institutions of higher learning, especially this university. Even the moon graces our occasion. We are glad you, our fellow-students and special friends of the higher learning, are here with us on campus again this evening. We hope this annual event may be a high point in your personal and professional lives in the years that lie ahead. Help us to make it so.

I am pleased with the opportunity to speak with you, but I must be very brief lest my words be an anti-climax. Lend me your hearts as well as your ears for just a moment and perhaps our thoughts together can be a fitting climax to a great evening.

As has been mentioned, this is the first of the endowed lectures in Higher Education — a series which we hope will speak for the best ideals and purposes of our Department, the School of Education, the University and the Higher Education community in general. We are deeply honored and encouraged that Dr. Norman Topping agreed to inaugurate this series by sharing with us, as he has just done, the best of his mind and heart. His distinguished achievement as a scholar and medical educator and as president of the University for twelve crucial and difficult years give special power to what he has said tonight. All who love and respect USC will always honor and respect his vital and creative contribution to its continued growth toward genuine greatness. That journey toward excellence to which he called us is an endless journey, either for an institution or an individual. This occasion will linger long

in our memories and add much to this fellowship of the higher learning which we are building.

At the risk of being in bad taste, I must say a word about these lectures. As many of you know, I have sometimes regretted that I agreed for the lectures to be given in my name while I am still living and active. I believe you understand that even the appearance of seeming to promote myself would be contrary to all I have tried to teach and live. But to get this project under way and to have it completed, as we hope to do, by this time next year — the year of our centennial celebration — seemed important. The worthiness and the nobility of the cause outweighed any personal feelings. A person, at most, in the life of the higher learning can be only a symbol — in a sense, a passing symbol.

I would be ungrateful if I did not express a word of appreciation to all who have worked to establish the endowment, all who support the idea by your presence here tonight, and especially to Professor Wilbur for his tireless and remarkably selfless effort on behalf of the Lectureship; he is a rare spirit.

Of course, I value the kind things that have been said about me and the warm good feeling they reflect. I wish more of them represented reality in addition to the love and kindness on which they are chiefly based; but really, friends, how could we live if reality were not softened, and even distorted a little, by love and deep care? So I am grateful and appreciative, but as soon and as much as possible let us downgrade the personal and center our minds and efforts on the significant and abiding purposes of the lectures: the promotion and support of the matchless ideas and ideals of the higher learning — creative, imaginative teaching and research.

Thus we have high hopes, dreams, and expectations for this annual lecture. The lecture and the atmosphere here on campus will strive to represent the very best purposes of the higher learning, and will help to renew our personal and group dedication to excellent teaching and the continuous search for truth. This is what the lecture series is about. We ask you to help us to sail our boats steadily by this star of clear and vivid purpose.

Finally a brief word to you, my former students, and friends. You do not expect me now or ever to abandon the role of teacher. We of this department, which of course is an

integral part of the School of Education and of the University, are very proud of you men and women who have studied and learned with us and those others of you who have been influenced by the ideals of the higher learning. You render a great service throughout the world. We believe you strive to represent well the best of the higher learning: its humble respect for truth; its willingness to work diligently to extend the borders of knowledge and understanding; its eagerness to teach so that truth may be embedded in character and personality; and, above all, its attempt to be a living example of personal and professional integrity. In carrying out these functions you do in your lives and in your work the tasks of the university of which you are a living part. In this way, in the words of the great Whitehead, we keep the vision of greatness steadily before us. By this process we may avoid the poison of cynicism and defeatism which is almost epidemic in our time, and we steadily become men and women illuminated and enlivened by faith. For as a young poet said: "Faith it is that keeps the world alive." We long in a time of much confusion and fear to cultivate the roots of faith — of trust.

THE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER AND POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION . . .

The Department of Higher and Postsecondary Education has emphasized in its curriculum an approach to the very important relationship between the American society and its education efforts within the higher learning. The interrelationships of thematic concepts in the development of higher and postsecondary education is a core aspect of each student's work within the Department.

Doctoral degree programs in the Department are available in a number of specializations for community junior college specialists, prospective staff members of senior institutions, as well as those already employed at public or private colleges or universities. In addition, master's, doctoral, and postdoctoral programs are available for students wishing to specialize in educational services, adult and continuing education, international higher education, career education and allied health professions. A specialized doctorate is also available in college student personnel services, in conjunction with the Department of Counseling. Certificate problems are available in adult training and adult counseling, the latter also jointly with the Department of Counseling.

Degree and certificate program developments have permitted the Department of Higher and Postsecondary Education to utilize nearby instititutions as a resource of training facilities for teachers, counselors, and administrators. Wide opportunities for research have also been made available, dealing with current issues and needs within various fields. Although an emphasis of Departmental effort is with preparation of professionals, research in related fields of professional development is also stressed.

New programmatic thrusts that have been generated over the past two years include expansion of the adult and continuing education program, marked by addition of a new full-time faculty member with this specialization; joint development with the Department of Counseling of a College Student Personnel Program; further development of course offerings that reflect international higher education interests; the funding of the Earl V. Pullias Lectureship, and where possible, for other services to the Department or the University.

THE 1979 PULLIAS LECTURE is a publication of the Department of Higher and Postsecondary Education, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 90007. The 1979 lecture monograph was edited by Clive L. Grafton. Printing was by University Graphic Art Services and production under the direction of Gordon Kemble and Steve Hamilton.